

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated February 4, 2005, claims 11, 12, 15, 16, and 19 are amended, claims 1-10, 13, 14, 17, 18 and 20 are canceled, and claims 23-30 are submitted. Claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 19 and 21-30 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarr et al. (USPN 5,184,179) in view of RD 330036.

As disclosed in the present application, the control device obtains the expiration date and/or time is obtained from the transmission date and/or time (i.e., the date and/or time of sending the command data) and threshold value information and determines whether or not the current date and/or time is not past the expiration date and/or time.

In contrast, Tarr et al. discloses that the computer control 16 (which corresponds to the control device) sends a signal to the billing computer (which corresponds to the centralized management device) when the predetermined time period has ended (see column 6, lines 39-54). However, in Tarr et al., the sending date to the billing computer is the predetermined time period, not from a transmission date of command data, but from a last sending data. Also, in RD 3300036, since the mail involves the expiration date and time, the receipt (which corresponds to the control device) does not comprise the threshold information.

To expedite prosecution, claims 1-10, 13, 14, 17, 18 and 20 are canceled, claims 11, 12, 15, 16, and 19 are amended, and new claims 23-30 are submitted.

New claims 23, 24, amended claims 11, 12, 15, 16 and 19, and claims 21 and 22 are directed to subject matter wherein the expiration date and/or time is obtained from the transmission date and threshold value information stored by the threshold value storing unit in the control device. Neither Tarr et al. nor RD 3300036 disclose or suggest that “the expiration date and/or time is obtained from the transmission date and threshold value information stored by the threshold value storing unit in the control device”.

New claims 25, 26 and 29 are directed to subject matter described on page 23, lines 15-17. Neither Tarr et al. nor RD 3300036 disclose or suggest a decision unit for decision (deciding) whether or not the command data received by the receiving unit includes the first expiration date and/or time, as required by these claims.

New claims 27, 28 and 30 are directed to subject matter described on page 27, lines 9-19. Neither Tarr et al. nor RD 3300036 disclose or suggest expiration date and/or time in accordance with the kind of the command, as required by these claims.

Thus, claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21 and 22, as amended, as well as new claims 23-30, are patentable over Tarr et al. and RD 3300036. Consequently, the allowance of claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21 and 22, as amended, as well as new claims 23-30, is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION


Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Application No.: 09/547,673

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Edward J. Wise
Registration No. 34,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 EJW:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: May 26, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**